

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	5-15
<i>Dasarupala Paddhati</i> (Sanskrit Text)	19-42
<i>Index of items in the Dasarupala Paddhati</i>	43-46
APPENDIX I	
A difficult illustrative verse in the <i>Dasaruparalola</i>	47-60
APPENDIX II	
Corrected text of the portion of the <i>Aralola</i> with Bhat'anrsimha's commentary	61-69

## Kuravi Rāma's *DASARŪPAKA-PADDHATI*

### \*INTRODUCTION

In the beginning of Kuravi Rāma's unpublished commentary on the *Viśvagunādarśacampū* the following two verses occur

*yaccetaś candracūde tataparīkalanad*  
*bhrngakītāyamānam,*  
*yenākāry appayādhvaryuditakuralayānandatip-*  
*pany amoghā !*  
*yaś campūbhāratīyām atanuta vivrtim*  
*svādyagūdhārthasāram,*  
*vyutpitsor daśarūpīty avahad iha mudam paddhatir*  
*vā yadiyā ||*  
*bhrātuh sāhityakalām sangopāngām adhītya*  
*gopālat !*  
*viśvagunādarśam sa vyākhyāti śrīkuravirāmah ||*  
(Hultsch, Report, I, extract 21, p 57)

The first line in the *Daśarūpaka-Paddhati* running as

*anavadhīkarunāvaridhīm ānamyātmani sadaśram*  
*devam*

shows that Kuravi Rāma was a devotee of Śiva, and the first line of the first verse quoted above refers to his deep and extensive meditation on his personal Deity, and thereby he seems to imply his consequent feeling of the Almighty's presence always, as

\*A major part of this Introduction was read at the 27th International Congress of Orientalists in Ann Arbor, Michigan, on Wednesday, the 16th of August, 1967, in Section 3 South Asia in Ancient and Classical Times.

he mentions in this context that his mind was like an example of the *bhramarakītanīyaya*<sup>1</sup> In the

1 The maxim of *bhramarakīta* refers to the case of an insect which having once been stung by a highly poisonous wasp remains always thinking of the wasp through deadly fear of being stung again and as a result sees the wasp in everything and finally gets metamorphosed into the form of the latter. The case is generally cited to emphasize the belief in the efficacy of meditation. The two following verses of Śankarācārya from his *Vivekacūdamāni* explain the significance of the *bhramarakīta-nīyaya*

*satī saktō naro yatī sadbhāvam hy ekanīsthajā |*  
*kītakō bhramaram dhyayan bhramaratvayā kalpate* (359)

*kṛijantarāsaktim apasya kītakō*  
*dhyayan yathalim hy alībhāvam rcchatī |*

*tathāiv yogī paramatmatattvam*  
*dhyatva samayatī tadekanīsthajā ||* (360)

I understand that the *bhramara* or *bhṛṅga* or *alī* of the *bhramarakītanīyaya* is not the generally known type of bee but the words in this context refer to a poisonous wasp which is also one of the allied species. Many opinions and theories of the past do not seem to be acceptable to the modern scientists. It is therefore no wonder and it is a different thing if the modern biologists should regard as fanciful the explanation of the so called *bhramarakītanīyaya* mentioned by Śankarācārya and others.

Though the verses of Śankarācārya refer to the change of form finally into that of the object of meditation, Kuravi Rāma's statement may perhaps be taken to refer to his deep and extensive meditation on his personal Deity and his consequent feeling of the Almighty's presence everywhere. A somewhat similar description of Kāṁsa's seeing Kṛṣṇa everywhere is found in the following verse of the *Bhāgavata*

*asīnah samīśams tīsthan bhunjanah paryāṣṭan mahim |*  
*cintayāno hr̥ṣīkesam apaśyat tanmayam jagat || Bh. ja. X 2 28*

It is not clear whether Kuravi Rāma's statement of *bhṛṅga* *kṣīṣāmanatva* has reference to any situation in his personal life or the simile is intended only to refer to the aspect of his constant meditation. I am indebted to Śrī P. N. P. Śāstrīyar for the information on the two verses of Śankarācārya quoted above. I also learn from my friend Mr. G. Ramasubba Śarma that Allasani Peddani, a Telugu poet of the 16th century, makes use of the *bhramarakītanīyaya* in his well-known work *Maruacaritramu* (2 33).

second and third lines of the same verse he speaks of his commentary on the *Kuvalayananda* of Appayya-dīksita and on the *Campūbharata*<sup>2</sup> In the fourth line he mentions his *Daśarūpī Paddhati* (the present work) In the second verse he says that he learnt the *sāhitya-lalā* from his brother Gopāla

As he wrote a commentary on the *Viśvagunādarśa* of Venkatādhvarin (of circa 1637 A D ) and as in his commentary the *Makarandajharī* on the *Kuvalayānanda* he criticizes vehemently the views and interpretations of Vaidyanātha Tatsat (1683 A.D ), the author of the *Candrikā*, another commentary on the *Kuvalayananda*, Kuravi Rāma could not have been earlier than the last part of the 17th century E Hultsch says in his Report, I, that our author is said to have lived at the court of one of the Zamindars of Kārvetīnagaram (then) in the North Arcot District Kuravi Rāma is also reported to have translated the *Vasavadatta* (of Subandhu?) into Telugu under the title of *Vāsavadatta-parinayam* In his *Makarandajharī* Kuravi Rāma says as follows

*kāvya-praśāsamukhalakṣanapārādrśvā*  
*kalyānavyabāhukāvya-vidhānacūñcuḥ |*  
*sāhityasāraṇidhīr appayadīksitīya-*  
*tyālahyām imam kuravīrāmākavīr vidhatte ||*

2 His commentary on the *Campūbhārata* known as *lasya* was published many times by the Narmadasagara Press, Bombay, of which I was able to get the fifth edition (1950) The title page of this edition, perhaps it was so in other editions too, is misleading as it mentions the commentator as Ramacandra Budhendra instead of Kuravi Rāma or Kuravi Rāmākavī The commentator on the *Campūramāyana* is known as Ramacandra Budhendra The author of the *lasya* on the *Campūbharata* is different from Ramacandra-Budhendra, and must be mentioned as Kuravi Rāma

He thus appears to have been a modern but prolific writer of South India, and a man of great erudition<sup>3</sup>

Kuravi Rāma's *Daśarūpaka-Paddhati* is not a commentary on the *Daśarūpaka*, as was mentioned by some scholars, but is an independent work on dramaturgy. As the author says in the beginning of the work

*vyutpitsumude kathayati daśarūpakavartma*  
*kuravirāmakaviḥ ||*

*yady api pūrvaiḥ kathitañ caitatā daśarūpakādīsu*  
*tathāpi |*

*vyutpitsūnām asmīn sugamāya param*  
*mamārambhah ||*

his intention in writing this handbook was to make the subject of dramaturgy attractive to those who were desirous of learning it without much trouble, although it had been dealt with by previous writers in works such as the *Daśarūpaka* (in which only after some patient efforts one could expect the pleasure of unde-

3 One can see in the *lasya* his references to and discussions on the topics of various branches of Sanskrit learning. For instance, see

(1)	N S P Edn 1950, page 297	( <i>Mīmāṃsā</i> )
(2)	" 304	( <i>Nyāya</i> )
(3)	" 319	( <i>Jyotisa</i> )
(4)	" 347	( <i>Vedānta</i> )
(5)	" 353	( <i>Gṛhyasūtra</i> )
(6)	" 461	( <i>Chandas</i> )
(7)	" 73	( <i>Śākuna</i> )

In addition to these, he quotes a number of authoritative works for supporting his own views. His criticisms of the interpretations of one Nṛsiṃha, another commentator on the *Campuhārata*, appear to be just and penetrating.

standing) This, therefore, is a brief treatise on dramaturgy consisting of verses, mostly *anustubh*, numbering just over a hundred Kuravi Rāma says at the end as

*daśottaraśataślokar daśarūpakapaddhatih,  
darsita sādhu kuravikulaksīrāmbudhīndunā |  
rāmasankhyāvata, kṛtyā prīyatām śankaro'nayā ||*

which informs us that the work consisted of one hundred and ten verses This seems to be a round number, as there are actually one hundred and ten and a half

He obviously draws upon the *Daśarūpaka* for his *Paddhatī* In his plan to compress the essentials of all the ten kinds of dramatic composition, he naturally avoids many details Many verses of the *Daśarūpaka* are incorporated by him, sometimes in full and sometimes with slight variations For instance the line in the DP

*garbhas tu drstanastasya bijasyāntesanam muhuh*  
(67-b)

is the same as 1-36 (a) of the *Daśarūpaka* Similarly the verses 56 and 57 of the DP are again reproduced from the DR Prose passages from Dhanika's commentary on the DR are utilized by Kuravi Rāma while giving some of his own verses, and at the same time making clearer some of the compound forms used in the *Ataloka* For instance Dhanika says on 1-23

(1) *ekena prayojanēnūvitānām kathāmsānām  
atāntarāikaprayojanasambandhah sandhit* (N.S.P  
ed 1941, p 6)

and the verse in the DP is

*ekaprayojanopetakathamśānām avantaraih |*  
*prayojanair yah<sup>4</sup> sambandhah sandhir esa tu*  
*pañcadha ||*

(2) *parisarpaprasāmaparopanyāsapuspānam*  
*prādhanyam*

is the statement of Dhanika (on 1-35, p 16), and here we have the verse as

*parisarpapragamaparopanyāsās ca puspakam |*  
*mukhyāny atra* *|| (vv 89-90)*

(3) Similarly at the end of the *mukhasandhi* Dhanika says

*etesām upaksepaparīkaraparīnyāsayuktyudbheda-*  
*samādhānānām avasyambhavitā (ibid p 11)*

where Kuravi Rāma has

*atra cādīmāh |*  
*trayo yuktyudbhedasamādhānāny āhuh*  
*pradhānatah || v 82*

(4) On 1-43 Dhanika says

*avamarsanam avamarsāh paryālocanam tacca*  
*krodhena va, vyanād vā, vilobhanena vā, 'bhavi-*  
*tavyam anenārthena' ityekāntaphalaprāptiyavasa-*  
*yātmā garbhasandhyudbhinnā bīarthasambandho*  
*vimarśo'vamarsāh (ibid p 21)*

and on this KR's verse is

*garbhasandhau prasiddhasya*  
*bīarthasyāvamarśanam |*  
*hetunā yena kenāpi vimarsah sandhir isyate || v 68*

4 Kuravi Rāma does not always observe the so called general rule of having a short vowel in the fifth syllable of the anushtubh

He sometimes seems to hold a view different from that of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* and the DR. For instance the *samavakāra* type of drama is defined in the NS. and the DR as *khyātavṛtta* (i e. having a theme well-known in the epics). But Kuravi Rāma says in this connection

*vīrapradhānāś ca rasā utpādyam itivṛttakam* (21-b)  
*so'sau samakavārah syād vīthyangaih kaiścid*  
*anvītaḥ* (24-a)

Vidyānātha in his *Pratāparudrīya* says about the plot of the *samavakāra* as *kalpitam itivṛttam prasiddham vā* (Bālamānoramā Press, 1950, p 74)

Kuravi Rāma does not mention the second alternative. No other writer seems to mention that the *itivṛtta* of the *samavakāra* can also be *utpādyā* (i e. invented). Similarly, Kuravi Rāma's simple statement

*śrngārādīprabhedena rasah syād astadhā*

perhaps implies his unwillingness to join others in the matter of accepting even the *śāntarasa*

One or two items such as *patāksepapraveśa*, *nāndī*, and *dhruvā*, which are not mentioned in the *Daśarūpaka*, are also included in the DP (See verses 63, 64 (a), 27, 29(b) to 33). The verse 63 in the DP runs as

*harsaśokādīsañjātasambhramādīvarānvitam |*  
*patāksepāt praviśati pātram; . . . . . ||*

In this context Ranganātha in his commentary on the *Vikramorvaśīya* says that *apatāksepa* (instead of *patāksepa*) is the correct expression. His remarks on this topic are worth quoting:



*ku*tracit tatah pravisanti apatiksepena iti  
*pa*thah sa natakagranthadarśananibandhanah  
*ya*tah 'nasucitasya patrasya praveśo nātake matah'  
 iti nātakasamayaprasiddher yatra asūcitapātra-  
 pravesas tatra akasmikapravesese apatiksepena  
 iti vacanam yuktaṃ atra tu prastavanante  
 sūcitūnam eva apsarasām pravesā iti kecit punah na  
 patiksepah = apatiksepah iti vighrahaṃ vidhāya  
 patiksepam vinava pravisanti iti samarthayunte  
 tad api āpādyakucodyamatram<sup>5</sup> ity āstām tavat  
 purūravasah pravesē tu apatiksepo yuktaḥ  
 asūcitavāt apatī = javanika, tasyāḥ ksepēna =  
 apasāranena apatī kāṇḍapataḥ syāt pratisira  
 javanika tiraskarīni iti halāyudhaḥ

(Vikr ed by S P Pandit, 1901, BSS, XVI,  
 Notes, p 9)

Thus Ranganātha prefers *apatiksepa* to *patiksepa*, but he does not say anything about the expression *pataksepa*, which also seems to be a reading in some manuscripts. See the same edition, footnote readings on page 3. *Pata* in *patāksepa* appears to be in the sense of *apatī* cited by Ranganātha. Professor Monier Williams in his edition of the *Śakuntala* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1876) gives the reading as *pataksepēna*

5 I learn through a personal communication from my teacher Professor Satkari Mookerjee that in the works on Indian Logic the expression *āpādyakucodyamatra* is understood thus *apadya* is the undesirable consequence *codya* is objection *kucodya* is a bad objection conceived in a captious spirit. (So) What is alleged to follow as the consequent (*apadya*) is but a frivolous issue—an objection which bespeaks a bad cavilling attitude.

(pp 144 & 230), and notes that this was the reading in many manuscripts and also according to the commentator Kāṭayavema. There is a close resemblance between Kāṭayavema's explanation *patāksepēna = yavanikapānodanēna = akasmāt, harsaśolādīyan.ita-sambhramayuktasya natasya pravesah patāksepēna kriyate*, and the verse 63 of the DP quoted above. The following verse of the NS (327,, Ch 32, GOS)

*adhruvas tu praveśāh syur gāyato rudatas tatha |  
sambhrame presane cava hy utpāte vismaye  
tathā |*

and one of the interpretations shown by Abhinava in his commentary on this verse, seem to be the basis for the significance of *patāksepapravesā* (i.e. hurried entrance of a character on the stage with a toss of the curtain) noted by Ranganātha, Kāṭayavema and Kuravi Rāma. The reading *apatāksepakrtā* (*apatāksepakrtū?*) in the verse 413 in the same chapter of the NS (GOS) seems to be dubious. Even if it be proved to be genuine, the word *āksepa* of the reading may perhaps be taken as a synonym of *apakarsana* mentioned in the verse 12-3 (*ibid*) *pate cawāpakarsite*, and the expression *apatāksepakrtā* may then mean "not by the (usual) drawing aside of the curtain" (but with a toss of the curtain, to indicate the hurried entrance). This may avoid any inconsistency between the two statements of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Ranganātha's implied preference of the expression *apatāksepa* over *patāksepa* is perhaps due to Amara's recording as *pato'stri syat* according to which the feminine form *patī* is incorrect.

Unlike the *Daśarūpaka*, the *Daśarūpaka-Paddhati* follows, while dealing subsequently with the items in

the *pratimirdesa*, the same order as that in which they were originally mentioned in the *uddesa*

In this brief compendium of dramaturgy Kuravi Rāma displays his mastery of the subject and a thorough knowledge of the *Natyāśāstra*, the *Daśarūpaka* and the *Avaloka*. The DP does not contain any discussion about the *rasa*,<sup>6</sup> the *nāyikas* and *nāyikas*, and their companions, etc. The *Daśarūpaka-Paddhat* is thus a short treatise on dramaturgy which can supply information on about 150 essential elements such as *arthaprakrtis*, *pañcāvasthās*, five *sandhis*, *sandhyangas*, *nāndī*, *dhruvā*, *patāksepapraveśa*, *aśrāvya*, *niyataśravya*, *janānta*, *apavaritaka*, *ākāśabhāsita*, etc., and the definitions of the ten varieties of the Sanskrit dramatic composition and their accessories

### THE EDITION OF THE TEXT

This edition is based on a single Palm-Leaf Manuscript of the text in Telugu characters preserved in the Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, with the number MSR 820 (c). I am happy to express my grateful acknowledgements to Śrī R. K. Pārthasārathi, the Curator of the Library for his kind permission to me to have a copy of the work.

While editing the text I have sometimes used some of the modern punctuation-marks such as comma and semicolon. If in an uneven part of a verse a unit of sense is found to be complete I have used the semicolon to indicate the completion of the sentence and

6 There is only the following statement  
*śrīgārādirabhedena rasah syad aṣṭadha*

the fact that the portion preceding the semicolon is not connected with the subsequent expression. At the end of the first half of a verse I have used one stroke, and two strokes at the end of the second.

I would express my gratitude to the Chairman of the Department of East Asian Studies, and the authorities of the Research Administration of the University of Toronto, whose generous grant enabled me to travel and collect some unpublished manuscript materials, one of which was the text of the *Daśarūpaka-Paddhati*, now being presented with Occasional Notes in the following pages.

श्री कुरविरामकृता

दशरूपकपद्धतिः

## श्रीगुरुभ्यो नमः

अनत्रधिकरुणाद्यारिधिमानग्यात्मनि सदाशिवं देवम् ।  
व्युत्पित्सुमुदे कथयति दशरूपकनर्म कुरविरामकविः ॥ १ ॥

यद्यपि 'पूर्वैः कथितञ्चैतद् दशरूपकादिषु तथापि ।  
व्युत्पित्सुतामसिन् सुगमाय परं ममास्मिन् ॥ २ ॥

नटैः प्रतिनिधीभूय स्वैः स्वैरभिनयैः स्फुटम् ।  
समायां नेतृचारित्ररूपणाद् रूपकं मतम् ॥ ३ ॥

धीरोदात्तादिभेदेन नायको बहुधा मतः ।  
नेतृणां चरितं प्राज्ञैरितिभृतमितोप्यते ॥ ४ ॥

प्रत्यातोत्पाद्यमिध्रप्रमेदात् तत् त्रिविधं मतम् ।  
भारतादौ प्रसिद्धं तु प्रत्यातं ; कथिकल्पितम् ॥ ५ ॥

1 The reading in the MS is not clear. It looks like  
*yady api pūrvam (or pūrvāre) . . . taddaśarūpkādisu tathāpi*

उत्पाद्यम् ; एतत्साङ्कर्यान् मिश्रं ; सर्वं रसाश्रयम् ।  
शृङ्गारादिप्रभेदेन रसः स्यादष्टधा ; त्रिधौ ॥ ६ ॥

अन्यत्रविस्तरेणोक्ताविति नात्र प्रपञ्चितौ ।  
नायकादिप्रभेदेन रूपकं दशधा विदुः ॥ ७ ॥

नाटकं च प्रकरण भाणः<sup>2</sup> प्रहसनं हिमः ।  
व्यायोगवीधिसमवकाराङ्गेहामृगा दश ॥ ८ ॥

सन्धिवृत्त्यन्विता सर्वे ; सन्धिरत्रे प्रदर्श्यते ।  
कैशिकयाद्या वृत्तयस्तु ; तासामन्यत्र विस्तरः ॥ ९ ॥

धीरोदात्तो यत्र नेता शृङ्गारो वीर एव वा ।  
रसः प्रधानम् , अन्येषां यथायोगमवस्थितिः ॥ १० ॥

2 The reading here seems to be in neuter as *bhānam*; but later on (v 13) masculine form is clearly given

प्रत्यातं वृत्तकं, सर्वे सन्धयस्तलु नाट्यम् ।  
यत्र नेता घोरशान्तः शृङ्गारस्य प्रधानता ॥ ११ ॥

पूर्वत्रचान्यद्, उत्पा(द्यं) वृत्तं प्रकरणं हि तत् ।  
नेता धूर्तविटो<sup>3</sup> यत्र सन्धी तु मुख्यनिर्देहौ ॥ १२ ॥

उत्पाद्यवृत्तम् (पत्तोऽ)ङ्कः सूच्यशृङ्गारवीरकः ।  
स भाणो ; यत्र हास्यं तु रसोऽन्यद् भाणवद् भवेत् ॥ १३ ॥

शुद्धयैकृतसङ्कीर्णभेदात् प्रहसनं<sup>4</sup> त्रिधा ।  
पापण्डविप्रप्रभृतिचेटचेटीविटाकुलम् ॥ १४ ॥

वेपमापादिसहितं शुद्धं हास्ययचोऽन्वितम् ।  
कामुकादि(वचो)त्रैवैः पण्डकन्बुकितापसैः ॥ १५ ॥

3 In the DR *dhūrta* is not found as an adjective to the *vita*. But the NS has *dhūrtaḥ śaśamprayojyah* (GOS, 18-110).

4 See the DR 3-54 and 55, p 74



कृतप्रहासाभिनय चिहृतं ; वीथिलक्षणम् ।

सङ्कीर्णं , <sup>5</sup>यत्र प्रसिद्धं घृतत रौद्ररसो भवेत् ॥ १६ ॥

अन्येषां हास्यशृङ्गारवर्जानामङ्गता पुन ।

नायका देवगन्धर्वपिशाचोरगराक्षसा ॥ १७ ॥

भूतप्रेतमुखा दृप्ताः सन्धयो मर्शवर्जिताः ।

चत्वारोऽङ्का द्विमस्य ; स्यादेको यत्र तु नायकः ॥ १८ ॥

5 If *yatra* is connected with previous expression, than the usual construction should have been by mentioning the *tat* and in a correct order as that *saukirnam* (*ucyate*) *vithilal sanam yatra* (*asti*), or it would be better if the derivatives of *yat* and *tat* are left out as Dhanika says *vithyangaih* (*saukirnatit*) *saukirnam*. If on the other hand *yatra* is connected with the subsequent portion, as he generally does while introducing a new item (see v 20), then also express mentioning of a form of *tat* is required according to Mammaṣa. Or we should take it that K R. does not agree with Mammaṣa and so a suitable form should be supplied. See for a discussion on the uses of *yat* and *tat* my paper 'Gleanings from the *Kāṭyaśra*', Journal of the Assam Research Society, v XIV, p 106

सन्धयोऽगर्भमर्शाः स्युः, कथा स्यादेकवासरः ।

मायिकी,<sup>6</sup> डिमवच्चान्यत् स व्यायोगः स्मृतो दुघैः ॥ १९ ॥

यत्रेतिवृत्तम् उत्पाद्यम् अङ्गकल्मसिस्तु भाषवत् ।

शृङ्गारोऽपरिपूर्णश्च सा वीथिरिति कीर्तिता ॥ २० ॥

यत्र द्वादश नेतारः <sup>7</sup>फलदेवासुरादयः ।

वीरप्रधानाश्च रसा <sup>8</sup>उत्पाद्य मितिवृत्तकम् ॥ २१ ॥

सन्धयो मर्शहीनाः स्युस्त्रयोऽङ्कास्ते पुनः क्रमात् ।

त्रैयामिकोत्सर्गदेवा<sup>9</sup>[युंत्थ]ञ्छङ्गकथात्रिकः ॥ २२ ॥

6 The reading in the MS is not clear. What is given above is my guess.

7 The verses dealing with *samarakāra* are a bit cumbersome. The reading in the MS in place is *caladevāsūrādayah*, of which *cala* is not clear in meaning. The DR and other texts record about the *phala* of the *nāyakas* in the *samarakāra* as “*phalam tesām (dvādasanāyakaṅām) prthak prthak*.” Therefore I think that the expression intended was perhaps *phaladevāsūrādayah* (taking the compound form to mean *phalayuktāḥ devāsūrādayah*).

8 See the Introduction on *itiritta* being *utpādyā* in the *samarakāra*.

9 As the author himself states *trayo'ṅkās te punaḥ kramāt*, the three Acts in the *samarakāra* are to be respectively of the duration of three *yāmas*, one *yāma*, and of half *yāma*. But the three lines containing the expressions *trāyā-*

<sup>10</sup>यामिकृत्तिनिरोधादिनिमित्तोपद्रवत्रिक ।

अर्धयामिकृत्तारभाग्धर्मादिकृत्थात्त्रिः ॥ २३ ॥

सोऽसौ समवकार स्याद् वीथ्यङ्गे कैश्चिदन्वित ।

प्राकृतो नायको यत्र प्रधान करणो रस ॥ २४ ॥

प्रख्यात वृत्तमङ्गस्य, <sup>11</sup>सन्ध्यङ्कौ भाणवन्मतौ ।

नेता धीरोद्धतो, वृत्त मिश्रमीदामृगे; रस ॥ २५ ॥

<sup>12</sup>शृङ्गाराभासो, मुष्पाद्या सन्धयोऽङ्गद्वये<sup>12a</sup> त्रय ।

अथैतेषामानुपूर्वी बक्ष्ये प्रणयनान्विताम् ॥ २६ ॥

*mika*, *yamika*, and *ardhayamika* are examples of defective compounding as subsequent expressions in each of the lines (i.e. compound forms) refer to all the three *and* as, whereas the words *trayyamika* etc. (which are part of the compounds) can only apply to one of the three. The construction of these three long compounds is not a happy one and it looks like an unsuccessful attempt of a difficult somersault. As it is illegible in the MS the reading shown within brackets is only my guess.

10 MS reads with one syllable less as  
*yamikagninirodhanimittopadravatrikah*

11 The reading in the MS appears like *vithyankau*

12 See footnote 2 of the Introduction

12a About *thamrga* there seem to be differences between the accounts found in the NS, the DR & the DP

तत्राष्टमिद्वादशभिरष्टादशभिरेव वा ।

द्वादशित्या पदैर्नान्दी; श्लोकः काव्यार्थसूचकः ॥ २७ ॥

सर्वेषामादिमोऽन्येऽत्र नेच्छन्ति नियमं तथा ।

सूत्रधारस्ततो रङ्गं प्रविश्य कतिभिर्नटैः ॥ २८ ॥

ऋतुं<sup>13</sup> स्तुवन् [ प्ररोचयेत् ] सेयमुक्ता प्ररोचना ।

सूचनी पात्रमेदानां<sup>14</sup> रसभावप्रकाशिनी ॥ २९ ॥

गीतिध्रुवा; कार्यमेदात् पञ्चधेय प्रकीर्त्यन्ते ।

प्रदेशसूचिकाङ्गादौ ध्रुवा प्रावेशिकी मता ॥ ३० ॥

प्रसङ्गमध्येऽन्यार्थस्याक्षेपाद् भाक्षेपिकी मता ।

नैप्रामिकी तु पात्राणां ध्रुवा निप्रामसूचिका ॥ ३१ ॥

13 MS reads as

*rtum stūyan* *seyam ukta prarocanā*

14 Bhoja's statement on *dhruvā* is

*seyam pātrapraśasarasanusandhānāḥprayojanā*  
*dhruvā*

See V Raghavan's work on Ś.P, edn, 1963, p 605

15 प्रासादिकी स्यात् पात्राणां व्याकुलानां प्रसादनात् ।  
विपादे विस्सये क्रोधे प्रवेशे सङ्गमे मते ॥ ३२ ॥

दोषप्रच्छादनादौ च गीयते या तु सान्तरी ।  
सूत्रधारो नटाचार्यो, रङ्गो नाट्यसभा स्मृतः ॥ ३३ ॥

नट पात्रं, तत् त्रिधा स्याद् उत्तमादिप्रभेदतः ।  
उत्तमं नायकादिः स्याद्; अमात्यादिस्तु मध्यमः ॥ ३४ ॥

दासीचिदूपकभ्लेच्छप्रमुचं त्वधमं मतम् ।  
ततः प्रस्तापना सेवामुद्यमित्युच्यते धुधैः ॥ ३५ ॥

सूत्रधारो नटीं प्रते मारिषं वा चिदूपकम् ।  
स्पर्शार्थं प्रस्तुताक्षेपि चिप्रोपत्या यत् तदामुद्यम् ॥ ३६ ॥

कथोद्घातः प्रवृत्तं तत् प्रयोगातिशयस्त्रिधा ।  
स्त्रेतिवृत्तसमं चान्यमर्थं वा यत्र सूत्रतः ॥ ३७ ॥

गृहीत्वा प्रविशेत् पात्रं स कथोद्घात ईरितः ।  
प्रस्तूयमानकालस्य गुणवर्णनया स्वतः ॥ ३८ ॥

प्रविशेत् सूचितं पात्रं यत्र तत् स्यात् प्रवृत्तरुम् ।  
'पयोऽयम्' इत्युपक्षेपी प्रयोगातिशयो मतः ॥ ३९ ॥

वीथ्या अङ्गान्यामुपस्थापीत्येषां लक्ष्म चक्ष्महे ।  
उद्घात्यकाश्रलगिते प्रपञ्चत्रिगते ह्यलम् ॥ ४० ॥

चान्त्रेत्स्यधिरले गण्डम् अचस्पन्दितनालिके ।  
असत्प्रलापव्याहारसृद्धानि त्रयोदश ॥ ४१ ॥

तत्रोद्घान्यं निगृढार्थं द्विधा प्रश्नोत्तरान्मना ।  
अन्यकार्यच्छन्नान्यकार्यस्य करणं तथा ॥ ४२ ॥

तेन प्रस्तुतकार्यस्य द्विधावलगितं मतम् ।

मिथ्यास्तोत्रं प्रपञ्चः स्यात् ; पूर्वरेकं नटादिभिः ॥ ४३ ॥

सम्भूयानेककार्याणां करणं त्रिगतं मतम् ।

वाक्यैर्बहिः प्रियैरन्तर्विप्रियेर्लोभनं छलम् ॥ ४४ ॥

साराङ्गक्षस्यापि वाक्यस्य नटाद्यैर्यन्निवर्तनम् ।

उक्तिप्रत्युक्तिभेदेन वाक्केलिर्द्विविधा मता ॥ ४५ ॥

<sup>16</sup>मिथ्याक्षेपोऽधिवलं ; गण्डं प्रस्तुतवाधिवाक् ।

रसादुक्तान्यथा व्याख्या त्ववस्पन्दितमीरितम् ॥ ४६ ॥

प्रद्वेलिका दुर्बोधार्था<sup>17</sup>, सोपहासा तु नालिका ।

असम्बद्धरूपासत्प्रलापो ; लोभोपहासवाक् ॥ ४७ ॥

<sup>16</sup> *adhivala* and *ganda* (which is given in masculine in the DR) are defined by Dhanañjaya thus

*anyonyavakyadhikyoktīḥ spardhayadhīvalam bhavet*

and

*gandah prastutasambandhibhinnartham sahasoditam*

(pp 67 & 68)

व्याहारो ; सृद्वं दोषगुणीकरणमीरितम् ।

यथासम्मचमत्रैषु केषाञ्चिद् ग्राह्यतां विदुः ॥ ४८ ॥

प्रस्तावनानन्तरं स्यादिति वृत्तप्रकाशनम् ।

तच्च द्विधा भवेत् सूच्यमसूच्यं चान्तिमं पुनः ॥ ४९ ॥

दृश्यं श्राव्यमिति द्वेधा ; तथैवान्तिममेतयोः ।

अश्राव्यं नियतश्राव्यमिति द्विविधमिष्यते ॥ ५० ॥

अथाध्यमन्यैरक्षेयम् ; आत्मन्येव स्थितं तु यत् ।

तदात्मगतमित्युक्त्वा काव्यवन्दे निवेशयेत् ॥ ५१ ॥

पद् एकेनैव विज्ञेयं <sup>17</sup>नियतश्राव्यमीर्यते ।

एतच्च द्विविधं प्रोक्तं जनान्तञ्चापवारितम् ॥ ५२ ॥

17. The DR says

*sopahāsā nigūdhārthā nālikava prahelikā* (p 68).

18 Though the expression *niyatāsrāvya* does not seem to occur in the NS, the two types *janānta* and *apavārta* are defined there (GOS, 25-89 & 90, p 281). See Abhinava's comment on this.



गुह्यं गुह्यतश्चेति जनान्तमपि च द्विधा ।  
स्याज्जनान्तिरुमित्युक्त्वा वाच्यं पूर्वं ; परं पुनः ॥ ५३ ॥

कर्णे पयमिवेत्युक्त्वा श्लाघ्य पश्चात् प्रसङ्गतः ।  
प्रकाशमित्युक्त्वातेपःमन्तेऽन्यार्थः प्रयुज्यते ॥ ५४ ॥

अप्रविष्टैः सहलापो यस्तद् भाकाशभाषितम् ।  
किं प्रतीपीत्यनूद्यैतत् पश्चात् कार्यं तदुत्तरम् ॥ ५५ ॥

दूराध्यानं घर्षं युद्धं राज्यदेशादिविप्लवम् ।  
निरोधं सुरतं स्नानं भोजनञ्चानुलेपनम् ॥ ५६ ॥

अशुक्रप्रद्वेषादीनि प्रत्यक्षाणि न निर्दिशेत् ।  
समाजोद्देशकारीति तद् पतत् सूच्यमुच्यते ॥ ५७ ॥

विष्कम्भचूलिवाद्याम्यप्रवेशाद्याचतारणैः ।  
सूच्यस्य सूचनं पञ्चविधमाहुर्मनीषिणः ॥ ५८ ॥

वृत्तवर्तिष्यमाणानां कथांशानां निदर्शकः ।

सङ्घेपार्थस्तु विष्कम्भो मध्यपात्रप्रयोजितः ॥ ५९ ॥

19 एकभाषान्वितः शुद्धो मिश्रोऽन्य इति स द्विधा ।

अन्तर्यवनितासंस्थैश्चूलिकार्यस्य सूचना ॥ ६० ॥

19 The previous line *samksepārthas tu* etc is the same as that in the DR 1-59 About the two types of *viskambhaka* (Explanatory Scene) the DR and Dhanika's comment thereon run as follows

*ekānekakṛtaḥ śuddhaḥ saṅkīrṇo nīcamadhyamaḥ (1-60).  
ekena dvābhyām iva madhyama-pātrābhyām śuddho bhavati  
madhyamādhama-pātraiv yugapat prayojitaḥ saṅkīrṇa itī*

The NS also records similarly 18-55 The above remarks explain that the mixture of low and middle class characters makes the *saṅkīrṇa-viskambha* different from the pure type in which only middle class characters participate In this context the statement of the DP

*ekabhāsānvitaḥ śuddho miśro'nya itī sa dvīdhā*

seems to explain the difference on the basis of employment of one or more languages respectively in the pure and the mixed types of *viskambha* Whether Sanskrit is meant by *ekabhāsa* or any language is not made clear Vidyānātha says clearly about these as

*hevalasamskṛtaprāyāḥ śuddhaḥ; saṅkīrṇapṛākīrtamī-  
śṛtaḥ saṅkīrṇaḥ (Bāla-manoranā Press edn., p 82).*

If this be the intention of Kuravi Rāma also, then there may not be any point of difference, as his statement would mean that Sanskrit is the language spoken in the pure type, and Sanskrit and Prakrit in the mixed type, the latter being the language generally allotted for the *viśapātras* in all the texts

अङ्गान्तपात्रेरङ्गास्यमुत्तराङ्गार्थसूचनम् ।

नीचपात्रप्रयुक्तस्तु विष्कम्भः स्यात् प्रवेशकः ॥ ६१ ॥

20 नैवाङ्ग आद्ये ; यत्रोत्तराङ्गार्थः पूर्णसङ्गतः ।

भसूचिताङ्गपात्रं तद् अङ्गावतरणं मतम् ॥ ६२ ॥

नेपथ्यं स्याद् यवनिका पात्राणां आवृत्तिर्मतम् ।

दृष्यशोकादिसञ्जातसम्भ्रमादित्वरान्वितम् ॥ ६३ ॥

पटाक्षेपात् प्रविशति पात्रम् ; अन्यत् स्वभावतः ।

पात्रं ; दृश्यं त्वभिनयेत् सन्ध्यङ्गपरिनिष्ठितम् ॥ ६४ ॥

21 एरुप्रयोजनोपेतकथांशानामवान्तरं ।

प्रयोजनैर्ये. सम्बन्ध सन्धिरेष तु पञ्चधा ॥ ६५ ॥

20 The MS reads *naṣānka ādye* which is obviously a scribal error.

21 See the Introduction.

मुखं प्रतिमुखं गर्भो विमर्शो निर्वेदस्तथा ।  
मुखं बीजसमुत्पत्तिर्नानार्था रससम्भवा ॥ ६६ ॥

22 लक्ष्यालक्ष्यस्य बीजस्य व्यक्तिः प्रतिमुखं मतम् ।  
गर्भस्तु दृष्टनष्टस्य बीजस्यान्वेषणं मुहुः ॥ ६७ ॥

गर्भसन्धौ प्रसिद्धस्य बीजार्यस्यावमर्शनम् ।  
हेतुना येन केनापि विमर्शः सन्धिरिष्यते ॥ ६८ ॥

बीजवन्तो मुखाद्यर्था विप्रकीर्णा यथायथम् ।  
एकार्थ्यमुपनीयन्ते यत्र निर्वेदणं हि तत् ॥ ६९ ॥

22 The DR has

*laksyālakṣyatayodbhedas tasya pratimukham bhavet*  
(1-30)

which is explained by Dharmika as

*tasya bījasya kṛcīllakṣyah kṛcīdalakṣya vodbhedaḥ prakāśanam*, where *laksyālakṣya* is taken to qualify *udbheda*, whereas the DP makes it an adjective of *bīja*.

सौख्यसम्पादनं प्राप्तिः ; नैपुण्यात्करणं तु यत् ।  
समाधानं , विधानं तु कारणं सुखदुःखयोः ॥ ८० ॥

परिभाषनमाश्रयावेशो ; व्यक्तं प्रकाशनम् ।  
उद्भेदः श्याद् ; भवेद् भेदो गुणप्रोत्साहनं ; कृतिः ॥ ८१ ॥

धीजानुगुण्यात् प्रकृतकार्यास्मिन् चोत्त चादिमाः ।  
26त्रयो युक्तयुद्भेदसमाधानान्याहुः प्रधानतः ॥ ८२ ॥

त्रयोदशाहानि 27विन्दुयत्नयुक्तसन्धिगान्यथ ।  
विलासः परिसर्पश्च विधूतं शमनर्मणी ॥ ८३ ॥

नर्मद्युतिः प्रगमनं चिरोधः पयुपासनम् ।  
घञं पुष्पमुपन्यासो वर्णसंहार इत्यपि ॥ ८४ ॥

26. See the Introduction

27. *binduyatnayuk sandhi* is *pratmukhasandhi*<sup>4</sup>

सम्मोगेच्छा विलासः स्याद् ; <sup>28</sup>दृष्टनष्टानुसर्पणम् ।  
परिसरौऽनिष्टवस्तुनिक्षेपः स्याद् विधूतकम् ॥ ८५ ॥

शमोऽरत्नेद्यपशमो ; नर्म स्यात् परिहासवार्कम् ।  
अनुरागोद्घाटनोत्था प्रीतिर्नर्मद्युतिः स्मृता ॥ ८६ ॥

षाड्शानुवाक्यैः स्वस्थानुरागराजप्रकाशनम् ।  
प्रगमः ; छन्नताभीष्टागमरोधो <sup>29</sup> विरोधकः ॥ ८७ ॥

पुंनुपासनमिष्टम्य जनम्यानुनयो भवेत् ।  
घञं निष्टुर्यार्कम् ; पुष्पमनुरागोत्थणं घञः ॥ ८८ ॥

उपन्यासो भवेद् रागहेतुवाक्यप्रपञ्चनम् ।  
चातुर्वर्ण्यप्रवचनं वर्णसंहार इष्यते ॥ ८९ ॥

परिसर्पप्रगमवज्रोपन्यासाश्च पुष्पकम् ।  
मुख्यान्यत्राथ गर्भस्य पताकात्याशिराजुजः ॥ ९० ॥

अभूताहरणं मार्गो रूपोदाहरणक्रमाः ।  
सङ्ग्रहश्चानुमानञ्च तोटकाधियले तथा ॥ ९१ ॥

उद्वेगसम्भ्रमाक्षेपा द्वादशाङ्गान्यनुक्रमान् ।  
अभूताहरणं प्रस्तुतोपयोगि चञ्चलाश्रयम्<sup>30</sup> ॥ ९२ ॥

मार्गो याथार्थ्यकथनं ; रूपमूहोदयं चचः ।  
प्रस्तुतोत्कर्षामिधानं स्याद् उदाहरणं ; क्रमः ॥ ९३ ॥

30 The MS reads *chalārjavam* The DR has *abhūtāhara  
yam chadma* (1-38).

त्रिग्नितामिः ; प्रस्तुतोपयोगि चानयं तु मङ्गप्रदः ।  
 त्रिहाद्भ्यूहनञ्जानुमानं ; गोपाद् भयोदितम् ॥ ९४ ॥

तोटकं न्याद् ; अचिरदमिति यञ्जनमोरितम् ।  
 ३। अथरागिजनाद् भीतिरुद्वेगः ; सम्भ्रमः पुनः ॥ ९५ ॥

शङ्काप्राप्ती ; अथाक्षेर इष्टार्थोपायमङ्गप्रदः ।  
 आर्था ह्री नोटकाक्षेपाचिरन्तान्यत्र मुत्स्यन. ॥ ९६ ॥

चिदुर्विमर्शम्याह्वानि नित्यातिप्रवरीयुजः ।  
 तत्रापवादः सन्नेष्टो विद्रवद्रवशक्तयः ॥ ९७ ॥

दुयुतिः प्रमददछन्नं व्यथमादो विरोधनम् ।  
 प्ररोचनं विचलनम् आदानश्च प्रयोदश ॥ ९८ ॥



अपवादस्तु दोषाणां प्रख्यापनमुदाहृतः ।

रोपालापस्तु सम्फेदो ; चिद्रवः स्याद् वधादिक्रम ॥ ९९ ॥

द्रवो गुहतिरस्कारः ; शक्तिर्वैरिनिरासनम् ।

तर्जनोद्वेजनद्वन्द्वं द्युतिः स्याद् ; गुरुकीर्तनम् ॥ १०० ॥

प्रसङ्गं प्राहुर् ; अयमाननं छलनमीरितम् ।

व्यवसायः स्वसामर्थ्यप्रशंसनमुदाहृतम् ॥ १०१ ॥

31a क्रोधसंरब्धयोरन्योन्याधिकेपो विरोधनम् ।

सिद्धयद् 32 मायिचच्छ्रेयःकथनं स्यात् प्ररोचनम् ॥ १०२ ॥

31a The MS reads *krodhasambaddhayoh* The DR has *samrabdhānāṃ virodhanam* (1-47).

32 The meaning intended seems to be *bhāvinaḥ śreyasaḥ kathanam yat tat* But it is a cumbersome expression

स्वगुणाधिष्ठितिः स्यात् विचलनं ; कार्यसङ्ग्रहः ।

३३ आदानं ; निर्वेदस्याङ्गान्यथ कार्यफलसृष्टाः ॥ १०३ ॥

सन्धिर्योषो<sup>३४</sup> प्रथमं निर्णयः परिभाषणम् ।

प्रसादानन्दममयाः [एतिर्मायोपगृह्णते ॥ १०४ ॥

पूर्वमायोपसंहारो प्रशस्तिश्च चतुर्दश ।

धीज्ञोपगमनं सन्धिर्योषः कायमार्गणम् ॥ १०५ ॥

कार्योपशेषं प्राहुर्प्रथमं ; निर्णय पुनः ।

धीज्ञानुगुणकार्यस्य प्रशस्यापनम् ; अयो मिथ ॥ १०६ ॥

अपवादस्तु दोषाणां प्रख्यापनमुदाहृतः ।

रोपालापस्तु सम्फेटी ; विद्रवः स्याद् वधादिकम् ॥ ९९ ॥

द्रवो गुरुतिरस्कारः ; शक्तिर्वैरिनिरासनम् ।

तर्जनोद्वेजनद्रन्दं द्युतिः स्याद् ; गुरुकीर्तनम् ॥ १०० ॥

प्रसङ्गं प्राहुर् ; अवमाननं छलनमीरितम् ।

व्यवसायः स्यसामर्थ्यप्रशंसनमुदाहृतम् ॥ १०१ ॥

31<sup>a</sup> क्रोधसंरन्धयोरन्योन्याधिकेपो विरोधनम् ।

सिद्धवद् 32 माविपच्छ्रेयःकथनं स्यात् प्ररोचनम् ॥ १०२ ॥

31a. The MS reads *krodhasambaddhayoh*. The DR has *samrabdhānām tīrodhanam* (1-47)

32 The meaning intended seems to be *bhāvīrah śreyasaḥ kathanam yat tat*. But it is a cumbersome expression

स्वगुणविष्टतिः स्यात् विचलनं ; कार्यसङ्ग्रहः ।

33भादानं ; निर्वहस्याङ्गान्यथ कार्यफलसृदाः ॥ १०३ ॥

सम्पत्तिविशेषो<sup>34</sup> प्रथमं निर्णयः परिभाषणम् ।

प्रसादानन्दसमयाः प्रतिभाषणोपगृहणे ॥ १०४ ॥

पूर्वमायोपसंहारो प्रदास्तिश्च चतुर्विंश ।

धीज्ञोपगमने सम्पत्तिविशेषः कार्यमार्गणम् ॥ १०५ ॥

कार्योपशेषनं प्राहुर्मथनं ; निर्णयः पुनः ।

धीज्ञानुगुणकार्यस्य प्रख्यापनम् ; मयो मिथ ॥ १०६ ॥

जरूपनं परिभाषा स्यात् ; प्रसादः पर्युपासनम् ।  
 भानन्दो वाञ्छितप्राप्तिः ; समयो दुःखनाशनम् ॥ १०७ ॥

कृत्तिलंघस्थिरीकारः ; प्राप्तकार्यानुमोदनम् ।  
 आभाषणं ; विचित्रार्थप्राप्तिः स्याद् उपगृहनम् ॥ १०८ ॥

इष्टकार्येक्षणं पूर्वभाव ; कार्योपसंहृतिः<sup>35</sup> ।  
 संहारः स्यात् ; प्रशस्तिस्तु शुभाशंसनमीरितम् ॥१०९ ॥

दशोत्तरशतश्लोकैर्दशरूपरूपद्धतिः ।  
 दर्शिता साधु कुरविकु लक्षीराम्बुधीन्दुना ॥ ११० ॥  
<sup>36</sup>रामसङ्घवाचता ; कृत्या प्रीयतां शङ्करोऽनया ॥ ११० ॥

धीपरमेश्वरार्पणमस्तु ।

दशरूपकपद्धतौ निर्दिष्टानां पारिभाषिकांशानां सूची

(मह्वपाः ऋतोरुत्तरान्विधेयः)

अङ्क ( रूपकेष्वन्यत्रमम्-तस्य लक्षणम्)	२४-२५
अङ्गावतरण	६२
अङ्गाम्य	६१
अङ्गगत	३५
अङ्गित	४६
अङ्गारितक	५३-५४
अर्थमकृति	७०-७१
अङ्गित	४२-४३
अङ्गित	४६
अङ्गाम्य	५१
अङ्गगत	४७
अङ्गागभाषित	५५
आशेदिकी घृणा	३१
आन्तरी घृणा	३२ ३३
आमुन्व (मन्त्रावना)	३५-३६
आरम्भ	७४
इतिवृत्त	४
ईदम्भ (तस्य लक्षणम्)	२४-२६
उत्तरगत	३४
उत्तर (इतिवृत्त)	६

प्रकरण(तस्य लक्षणम्)	११-१२
प्रकरी	७३
प्रम्यात (इतिवृत्त)	५
प्रनिमुरमन्धि	६७
प्रनिमुस्त्राङ्ग (सप्तोदशाङ्गानि)	८३-९०
प्रत्यक्षनिर्देशानर्द	५६-५७
प्रपद्य	४३
प्रपत्न	७४
प्रयोगानिश्चय	३९
प्ररोचना	२८-२९
प्रवृत्त (प्रवृत्तक)	३८-३९
प्रवेशक	६१
प्रदसन	१३-१६
प्रदेलिका	४७
प्राप्त्याशा	७५
प्राघेदिकी भ्रुवा	३०
प्राघादिकी भ्रुवा	३२
फलागम	७६
विन्दु	७२
वीज	७२
भाल (नम्य लक्षणम्)	१२-१३
मन्वन्वत्त	३४
मिष (इतिवृत्त)	६
मुन्वमन्धि	६६
मुन्वङ्ग (द्वादशाङ्गानि)	७७-८०

उद्धात्य	४२
कथोद्घात	२७-३८
कार्य	७३
गण्ड	४६
गर्भसन्धि	६७
गर्भाङ्ग (द्वादशाङ्गानि)	९०-९६
चूलिका	६०
छल	४४
जनान्त (जनान्तिक)	५३
डिम (तस्य लक्षणम्)	१६-१८
त्रिगत	४३-४४
ध्रुवा (तस्या लक्षणम्)	२९-३०
नट	३४
नाटक (तस्य लक्षणम्)	९-११
नान्दी (तस्या लक्षणम्)	२७
नायक	४
नियतश्राव्य	५२
नियतासि	७५
निर्वेहणसन्धि	६९
निर्वेहाङ्ग (चतुर्दशाङ्गानि)	१०३-१०९
नेपथ्य	६३
नैष्कामिकी ध्रुवा	३१
पद्यावस्था	७०-७१
पटाशेषप्रवेश	६३-६४
पताका	७३



प्रकरण(तस्य लक्षणम्)	११-१२
प्रक्षरी	७३
प्रम्यात (इतिवृत्त)	५
प्रतिमुखमन्त्रि	६७
प्रतिमुखारू (सयोदनाङ्गानि)	८३-९०
प्रत्यस्निदेशानर्ह	५६-५७
प्रवय	४३
प्रयत्न	७४
प्रयोगानिश्चय	३०
प्ररोचना	२८-२९
प्रवृत्त (प्रवृत्तक)	३८-३९
प्रवेशक	६१
प्रदसन	१३-१६
प्रदेलिका	४७
प्राप्त्यना	७५
प्रापेनिक्षी घुवा	३०
प्रापदिक्षी घुवा	३२
प्रापम	७६
पिन्दु	७२
बेज	७२
भग (तस्य लक्षणम्)	१२-१३
भगवन्त	३४
निघ (इतिवृत्त)	६
मुखमन्त्रि	६६
मुख प्र (सयोदनाङ्गानि)	७७-८०

मृदव	४८
रस	६
रङ्ग	३३
रूपक (तस्य लक्षणम्)	३
रूपक (दश रूपकाणि)	८
षाक्केलि	४५
विमर्शसन्धि	६८
विमर्शाङ्ग (त्रयोदशाङ्गानि)	९७-१०३
विष्कम्भ	५९-६०
वीथि (तस्या लक्षणम्)	२०
वीथ्यङ्ग	४०-४१
व्यायोग	१८-१९
व्याहार	४७-४८
सन्धि (तस्य लक्षणम्)	६५-६६
समवकार (तस्य लक्षणम्)	२१-२४
सूत्रधार	३३

APPENDIX I

A DIFFICULT ILLUSTRATIVE VERSE IN THE  
DASARŪPAVALOKA

मृदव	४८
रस	६
रङ्ग	३३
रूपक (तस्य लक्षणम्)	३
रूपक (दश रूपकाणि)	८
षाक्केलि	४५
विमर्शसन्धि	६८
विमर्शाङ्ग (त्रयोदशाङ्गानि)	९७-१०३
विष्कम्भ	५९-६०
वीथि (तस्या लक्षणम्)	२०
वीथ्यङ्ग	४०-४१
व्यायोग	१८-१९
व्याहार	४७-४८
सन्धि (तस्य लक्षणम्)	६५-६६
समवकार (तस्य लक्षणम्)	२१-२४
सूत्रधार	३३

## APPENDIX I

### \*A DIFFICULT ILLUSTRATIVE VERSE IN THE DAŚARŪPĀVALOKA

In my article on the *Daśarūpaka* published in the Journal of the University of Gauhati, Vol XI, 1960 (ARTS), I tried to discuss some of the problems connected with Dhanika's *Avaloka* on the *Dasarūpaka*. I could not find then definite solutions to many of the problems, and I only offered my suggestions in several cases, and in one case I produced some interpretations that were supplied to me by some well-known scholars in the field when I referred the matter to them. One of the problems I was struggling hard to find a solution to, was a Prakrit<sup>1</sup> verse given by Dhanika in the fourth chapter under *kārikā* 34 (page 91, N S P edition, 1941)

The text of the verse as available in print was highly unintelligible, and before publishing my paper I wrote to Professor Dr A N Upādhye of Kolhapur, requesting him to furnish me with the *chāyā* of the verse under reference and the source thereof etc if possible. On receiving my letter Professor Upādhye also consulted some of his friends in this matter, and supplied me with a *chāyā* of his own rendering and a second one by one of them. These two *chāyās* and the interpretations were purely tentative, and I produced them as such with the same remark in my paper on the *Daśarūpaka* referred to above.

\*Paper read at the meeting of the American Oriental Society, Berkeley, California March 1968

1 I am using the word Prakrit in a general way in the sense of any vernacular derived from and akin to Sanskrit, including even the lowest forms of the dialect just as the one in the expression *Prākṛta vyākaraṇa* used by Trivikrama and Hemacandra covers all dialects including Apabhraṃśa

## APPENDIX I

### \*A DIFFICULT ILLUSTRATIVE VERSE IN THE DAŚARUPĀVALOKA

In my article on the *Daśarūpaka* published in the *Journal of the University of Gauhati*, Vol XI, 1960 (ARTS), I tried to discuss some of the problems connected with Dhanika's *Avaloka* on the *Daśarūpaka*. I could not find then definite solutions to many of the problems, and I only offered my suggestions in several cases, and in one case I produced some interpretations that were supplied to me by some well-known scholars in the field when I referred the matter to them. One of the problems I was struggling hard to find a solution to, was a Prakrit<sup>1</sup> verse given by Dhanika in the fourth chapter under *kārikā* 34 (page 91, N S P edition, 1941)

The text of the verse as available in print was highly unintelligible, and before publishing my paper I wrote to Professor Dr A N Upādhye of Kolhapur, requesting him to furnish me with the *chayā* of the verse under reference and the source thereof etc if possible. On receiving my letter Professor Upādhye also consulted some of his friends in this matter, and supplied me with a *chāyā* of his own rendering and a second one by one of them. These two *chāyās* and the interpretations were purely tentative, and I produced them as such with the same remark in my paper on the *Daśarūpaka* referred to above.

\*Paper read at the meeting of the American Oriental Society, Berkeley, California March 1963

1 I am using the word Prakrit in a general way in the sense of any vernacular derived from and akin to Sanskrit, including even the lowest forms of the dialect just as the one in the expression *Prakṛta vyākaraṇa* used by Trivikrama and Hemacandra covers all dialects including Apabhraṃśa.

Several years after the publication of that paper containing the two *chāyās* and the possible interpretations conveyed by Dr Upādhye and Dr P. L. Vaidya, I noticed recently a<sup>2</sup> paper on the same verse appearing in the H. D. Velankar Commemoration Volume which was published in October, 1965. The writer of this paper remarks on page 197 thus "No modern commentator or scholar has offered, to my knowledge, any interpretation of the verse." The odd thing about this, as I understand from a recent letter (November 8, 1967) written to me by Professor A. N. Upādhye, is that this person was also one of the many to whom this verse together with the problems raised by me, was shown by Professor Upādhye. Therefore it is surprising that no acknowledgement of any sort or reference to Dr Upādhye and Dr Vaidya, or to the tentative inter-

2 The title of the paper "An obscure Apabhramśa verse quoted in the *Dasarūpa*" is not accurate. The verse occurs in the *Ataloka*, and not in the *Dasarūpa*. Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha says in the beginning

*Dasarūpasya yā vyākhyā dhanikena samīritā,  
tasyā bhāṣanṛsimhena laghvī śikā vidhīyate |*

One or two points in the paper, though very minor, are surprising, and therefore I should like to pointing them out here, with the intention of facilitating future correction. The writer of that paper says on p. 197.

(a) "The commentator of the *Ataloka* is constrained to remark *nitānta-asphuṣatrōd asya ślokaśya vyākhyā na likh-yate asmābhīḥ*" The spacing in the compound-form is of course given by the writer of the paper. This remark was not made by the commentator (or the author) of the *Ataloka*, but it was by the editor of the text. No commentary on the *Ataloka* was published by the N. S. Press, and the above sentence seems to have been quoted from the N.S.P. edition of the *Dasarūpa*, though there is no reference to the particular edition from which he has quoted this.

(b) On page 198 (and twice again on page 200) he gives the ablative and primitive form of *anya* in feminine in Sanskrit as *anyāḥ*. (in the last but one paragraph) *Anyā* being a pronoun, the form should have been *anyasyāḥ*.

pretations supplied by them, appears in this recent article of the year 1965. Instead of making the necessary acknowledgement and a reference to these scholars, his remarks to the contrary (quoted above) seem to be unfair and unscholarly.

He has collected some different readings of the verse in the *Avaloka*, and has tried to explain its meaning and application in the context. Instead of reproducing his interpretations and the details, I should like to request the interested readers to see for themselves the paper appearing in the H D Velankar Commemoration Volume.

Now I should turn to the problem of the original verse and the *chāyā* and to the possible solution that I have been able to gather from genuine sources. Even after the publication of my paper in 1960, many of the problems in the *Avaloka* have not ceased to engage my attention. Dhanika's *Avaloka* is a highly learned Commentary, and naturally it bristles with many difficulties to which the defective editions available in print add further, and consequently I found it very hard to overcome these difficulties without the help of a suitable sub-commentary. In my search for such a help, only recently I was able to get the transcripts of Bhattanrsimha's Commentary, called *Laghutikā*, on the *Avaloka*. I have just completed working on this *Laghutikā* and the *Daśarūpāvaloka*<sup>2a</sup>. I feel that though

2a I am glad to inform that the authorities of the Adyar Library and Research Centre Madras are publishing soon the entire work on the *Daśarūpāvaloka* consisting of the text the *Avaloka* with corrections in 347 places the brilliant commentary of Bhattanrsimha, an Introduction and two separate Footnotes, etc. The work will appear as number 97 of the well known Adyar Library Series and may come to about 360 pages in Demy Octavo size.



very brief the commentary seems to prove very useful in settling the various readings and the interpretations of the text of the *Avaloka*

In the case of this difficult Apabhramśa verse also some welcome light is thrown by Bhaṭṭanrsimha, and it is he who comes to our help in getting a solution for the first time to this otherwise unyielding and intractable illustration. I submit here what I have been able to collect from the manuscript material of his *laghutikā* in this connection. Bhaṭṭanrsimha gives this Apabhramśa verse with a different reading, and its *chāyā*<sup>3</sup> I quote the portion here, with some corrections effected by me, consisting of the verse and the Sanskrit *chāya* together with his comments thereon.

(भट्टनृसिंहस्य लघुटीका)

व्यवधानेन अविरोधमुदाहरन्ति —

अण्णाउ<sup>१</sup> ताउ महिला जह परिमलसुअंधु ।

मह कंतह अलीणउ<sup>४</sup> वणवीसअगंधु ॥

3 The reading of the verse available in print without *chāyā* is this

*annahunāhumaheliahuhuparimalususuamdhū,  
muhukamtaha agatthahaamga na phittai gamdhū |*

4 The spacing in this verse is mine. The manuscript reads in a continuous way. Sometimes in the Telugu Ms an *anusvāra* or *anusvara* like symbol (or zero called *nollu*, according to Dr Upādhye in his letter who adds that it was the case with Kannada manuscripts too—I noticed it also in the Grantha MS—) is used before a consonant to indicate that the following consonant is to be duplicated. Consequent on this practice the two words *amṇau* and *amṇau* are found with this symbol and I have given them in the text with the consonants duplicated.

(छाया)

अन्यास्ता महिला यथा परिमलसुगन्धाः

मम कान्तस्य आश्रितो<sup>5</sup> नगदिसुगन्धः ॥

अत्रान्यासामसौभाग्यं<sup>6</sup> तद्विप्रयतमानामशौर्यञ्च स्वसौभाग्यप्रकटनेन स्वभर्तुः<sup>7</sup> शौर्यप्रकटनेन च स्वात्मनो निन्दान्याजेन<sup>7</sup> काचिद् ब्रूते । अन्याः खलु ताः स्त्रियो यासामङ्गरागानुकूलश्चिरस्थायी परिमलः । मम तु निर्माग्यायाः कृतेऽप्यङ्गरागे भर्तृनणकृतविसुगन्ध एवेत्यर्थः ।

In the *Avaloka* Dhanikas' remarks on this verse run thus  
इत्यत्र बीमत्सस्य अङ्गभूतरसान्तरव्यवधानेन शृङ्गारे समावेशो न विरुद्धः ।

While explaining the verse IV-34 of the *Daśarupaka* containing the definition of *sthāyibhāva*, Dhanika's *Avaloka* has a lengthy and a very learned discussion related to the topic. A part of the discussion is devoted to the question of opposition or incompatibility (*virodha*)

- (1) between *sthāyibhavas* and *vyabhicari-bhāvas*, and
- (2) between two *sthāyibhāvas*.

Of the second type again two possibilities are mentioned

- (a) One is an instance where, though the two are incompatible, one *sthāyibhāva* is *angin* and the other an *anga*, and the *ālambana-vibhāvas* of the two are different,

5 The Telugu manuscript reads *āsrīte*, but Madras Govt. transcript, Adyar Grantha Ms and the Trivandrum transcript — all give *āsrito*, and so I have given this

6 The Telugu Ms reads *atrasām* etc. Madras Govt. transcript reads *atrānyāsām*, whereas the Trivandrum transcript gives *yadanyāsām*. I Preferred *atranyāsām*

7 The portion from *svabhartaḥ* to *nindāvyājenā* is left out in the Telugu Ms whereas the Madras transcript, the Adyar Grantha Ms and the Trivandrum transcript<sup>7</sup>—all these<sup>7</sup> contain the reading

- (b) and the second may be a case where again, of the two incompatibles, one *sthāyibhāva* is *angin* and the other an *anga*, and the *ālambanavibhāvas* of the two are not different, but one and the same.

Here Dhanika says that the first instance of the second type is all right, and it is possible to have in a composition (descriptions of appropriate elements of) such incompatible *rasas* (or the *sthāyibhāvas*<sup>8</sup> as is understood from the expression in the context) because of the fact that the *ālambanavibhāvas* are different, and that the second instance of the second type should be avoided (*Avaloka* has this sentence *viruddharasakalambanatvam eva virodhahetuh*, and on this *Bhattacharya* comments *sthāyino rasasya angabhutar apī rasāntarair ekāśrayatvam pariḥaranīyam ity arthah* See Appendix II) Or, says Dhanika, this too may be possible in spite of the fact that the *ālambanavibhāva* of the two is one and the same, if there be (appropriate elements of) a third intervening *rasa* which is *not incompatible* with either of the two (The following remark of Dhanika *sa tv aviruddharasāntaravyavadhānenopanibadhyamāno na virodhī* is introduced by *Bhattacharya* thus *kim tat sarvathā tyajanīyam eva teṣām ekāśrayatvam ? nety āha - sa tv itī*) Otherwise, without the intervention of such a third *rasa* the second instance of the second type should be avoided (Dhanika remarks *prakārāntarena ekāśrayavirodhah*

8 As it is the *sthāyibhāva* which when fully developed becomes the *rasa*, the term *rasa* is also used in this context to stand for the *sthāyibhāva*. A similar usage of the term is found in other treatises too, and it is so explained by *Abhinava* as well (*bhāvinīṇ vṛttim āśṛitya odanaṇ pacatīmad*).

*parihartavyah*, and on this Bhattanrsimha comments *prakarantarena=avyavadhānena*, i e *aviruddharasantarāvvyavadhānena*)

The Prakrit verse in the context is given by Dhanika for the second instance of the second type with the intervention of a third *rasa*, which is not incompatible with the *angin* as well as the *angarasa*, and of this verse Bhattanrsimha's *lakhutika* gives the above reading, the *chāyā* and his own comments

Even in the reading as given by Bhattanrsimha I felt some difficulty in the fourth *pāda* of the Prakrit verse. After referring this point to him I got a kind reply from Professor Dr Upādhye, the relevant contents of which I shall be mentioning soon. The point of difficulty is this. I learn from the *Prākṛta-Sabda-Mahārṇava* (P S M) that *vissa* or *vīsa* are the Prakrit forms for the *visra* of Sanskrit. The *chāyā* in the manuscripts clearly reads as (*vra*na)-*visragandhak* for which the Prakrit form should have been (*v*ana)-*visagamdhu* or *vī*sagamdhu. But the reading in a manuscript (Telugu) seems to contain the spelling as (*v*ana)*vī*sa<sup>a</sup>agamdhu. And here again the syllable "ra" (it looks like "ra") is seen in a smaller size and slightly above the level of the other letters. It was perhaps inserted by the scribe later, though there is no insertion mark visible.

I. It was not clear to me as to whether I should take the form as *vī*saraagamdhu or *vī*saagamdhu or *v*isagamdhu. Sometimes in the Prakrit forms *svarthekah* (Cf Trivikrama's *Prākṛta-vyākaraṇa-vṛtti* 2-1-18) is permitted of which only "a" remains (except in the Paisaci where the entire form is said to be retained), although the corresponding Sanskrit form may not

actually have the similar *svārthe kah*<sup>9</sup> The examples given are *candrah*=*can dao*, and *ihā*=*ihaa* (Trivikrama, 2-1-18)

II About the metre of the verse too I had my doubts From looking into Hemacandra's *Chando'nuśāsana*, I thought it might be *pañcānanalalitā* (same *daśa oje dvādaśa pañcānanalalitā*, p 204, edited by Professor Velankar, 1961, i e ten and twelve *mātras* in the even and odd *pādas* respectively) On my request for a clarification on these points Professor Upādhye was kind enough to write to me (on November 8, 1967) stating that *vīsaraagamdhu* could be taken as the form in the context, and that the metre might be *makaradhvajahāsa* (same *ekādaśa oje dvādaśa makaradhvajahāsa*, Ibid p 205)

I had to write to him again as I felt some difficulty in adopting the form *vīsaraagamdhu*, because except in the case of some specific forms (*śrī* etc, Cf Trivi 1-4-99, and others), the "r" occurring as the final of the conjunct consonants is elided in the Prakrit forms as is recorded in *ro lukam adhaḥ* (Trivi 3-3-5), and therefore it did not seem possible to retain the "r" of the *visra* of Sanskrit in the Prakrit forms I also asked for his opinion as to whether there was anything wrong in taking the verse to be in the metre of *pañcānanalalitā*, as its definition seemed to be applicable here too

In his second letter of the 12th December, 1967, Professor Upādhye informed me that if the *mātrās*

9 I am indebted to Professor Upādhye for this information also In Sanskrit however *visraka* is rarely found *Sārngadharaśamhita* (3-12-9) has the following

*pittaṃ pītena haritam nīlam śyāvāi ca visrakam* In the *chāyā* of the verse in this context no manuscript gives *visraka*

agreed any name could be suggested for the metre of the verse, and that that way the Apabhramsa<sup>10</sup> left "a broad margin" for different opinions. He also stated that retention of "r" after *svarabhakti* was not impossible in the Apabhramsa. Finally he however conveyed his opinion that if the reading *visaa-* be found that was quite welcome.

Here I should mention that the transcript of the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library reads in this place as *visagamdhua*, whereas the Trivandrum transcript gives as *visaamgamdhasu*. The Grantha manuscript (Adyar) seems to be corrupt. I therefore felt like depending upon the Telugu manuscript, and taking the expression as *visaagamdhu*,<sup>11</sup> and after some corrections about which I have discussed in the notes, I chose the reading of the relevant portion as given before on page 52.

From the comments of Bhattanrsimha in this context it appears that in this verse a particular lady was praising other ladies for their sweet smell which was lasting long and was agreeable to the cosmetics they used and that at the same time she was deploring her own self because of the fact that whatever be her make-up, with her it was (always) the smelling of a raw meat (*visragandha*) caused by the wounds on the body of her husband (who being a valorous warrior

10 Different opinions are not uncommon in Sanskrit too. An instance of an *aupacchandāsika* coming under *matra chandas* in the *Vṛttaratnakara* is given the name of *māla bhāriṇī* and treated under *ardhasamavṛttas* by Hemacandra.

11 By applying the *svārthe* *lah* we can get the form *visaa* in the Prakrit although the Sanskrit here does not have *visraka* where all the manuscripts read only *visra*.

used to sustain them in the course of his (various battles) This is only a seeming praise for the other ladies, and the intended implication is that she was really fortunate in having for her a husband who was an illustrious warrior, and it was the other ladies who were not fortunate because of the fact that their husbands were cowards and consequently never stayed in the battle-field for any time, as it should be evident from the absence of any such wounds on their bodies

Here in spite of the fact that one is the *angin* (*srngaru*) and the other the *angarasa*, the two *rasas* *bībhatsa* and *srngāra* are opposed to each other, and although the *alambanavibhāva* is the same person (her husband, the courageous hero), yet it is possible to have the two because of the intervening *vīrarasa*, as there is no *bādhyabādhakabhāva*<sup>12</sup> between *srngāra* and *vīra* and between *vīra* and *bībhatsa*<sup>13</sup> Therefore the aesthetic experience in this case is not adversely affected

The intervening *rasa* in this instance seems to be *vīrarasa* because of the comments *svabhartuḥ śaurya-prakatanena tatprīyatamānām asauryam kacid brūte* by Bhaṭṭanrsimha and need not be the *hasyarasa* as was once tentatively surmised This seems to be corroborated by a reading of the relevant sentence of the

12 It is possible for a person to love his wife and at the same time to be an illustrious warrior Similarly, in spite of some wounds on the body of her husband the wife can still love him or more so for these very wounds which may make her feel proud because these are symbols of his valour in fighting courageously in the battles

13 The *vīruddharasas* are mentioned thus  
*srngarabībhatsarasau tathā vīrabhayānakau,*  
*raudradbhutau tathā hāsyakarunau vairīnau mīthah |*  
 (*Srngāratilaka*)

*Avaloka* in a manuscript<sup>14</sup> (Telugu) of the Adyar Library, running as

*ity atra bibhatsasya vīrarasavyavadhānena  
śrngāre samaveśo na viruddhah*

(page 50, MS 68287)

This sentence coming as a comment by Dhanika on the Prakrit verse is found in the place of the one available in print, which was quoted earlier on page 53

From these available data it should be possible for us to set aside all unnecessary conjectures regarding this once-difficult illustrative verse. I feel that the portion of the *Laghutikā* of Bhattanrsimha given above on page 52-53 may be taken as representing a genuine source and affording a correct interpretation. Personally, after several years of hard struggle in the matter, I feel very happy for the solution to the mysteries of this verse, which has been made possible by the learned comments of the great Bhattanrsimha.

14 This manuscript however gives a different reading of the *Avabhramsa* verse and without *chaya*, the merits of which I do not propose to discuss here.



APPENDIX II

CORRECTED TEXT OF THE PORTION OF THE AVALOKA

on verse IV-34 of the *Daśarūpa*

with

Bhaṭṭaṅṣimha's Commentary, the *Laghutikā*

## APPENDIX II

### CORRECTED TEXT OF THE PORTION OF THE AVALOKA

on verse IV-34 of the *Dasarupaka*

with

Bhattanrsimha's Commentary, the *Laghutika*

As the Apabhramśa verse discussed in my paper (given as Appendix I) forms the final part of the continuous topic dealt with in the preceding lines of the *Avaloka*, and as this portion of the *Avaloka* too as available in print has many mistakes, I thought of giving here the relevant portion of Bhattanrsimha's commentary, and the related text of the *Avaloka* based on a Telugu manuscript of the Adyar Library, Madras, with some corrections which in my opinion were needed. It is my sincere hope that the portion of the commentary and the text given here will facilitate a better understanding of the topic.

I am delighted to express my hearty thanks and acknowledgement to the authorities of the Adyar Library, of the Govt Oriental MSS Library, Madras, and of the Trivandrum MSS Library, now of the University of Kerala, for their kindness in supplying me with the following material:

- (1) Microfilm copy of the Palm-leaf Telugu Ms of *Avaloka* and DR, with the number 68287, Adyar Library,
- (2) Microfilm copy of Palm-leaf Telugu Ms of Bhattanrsimha's Comm (75365) Adyar Library,

- (3) Microfilm copy of Palm-leaf Grantha Ms of Bhaṭṭanrsīma's Comm (70066) Adyar Library,
- (4) Transcript of last item (70066) Adyar Library,
- (5) Transcript of Bhaṭṭanrsīma's Comm R 2421, Madras Govt Oriental MSS Library,
- (6) Transcript of Bhaṭṭanrsīma's Comm 1974-B, Oriental MSS Library, Trivandrum

As I hope to discuss at a later stage different readings and allied matters of the manuscripts of the commentary, I do not propose to discuss them now. After a careful collation of the different copies at my disposal I have selected and given the readings in this portion, which I thought to be suitable and necessary on the basis of the evidence available.

(घनिकस्य दशरूपावलोकः— ४-३४)

अथ स्थायी :—

विरुद्धैरविरुद्धैर्वा भावैर्विच्छिद्यते न य ।

आत्मभाव नयत्यन्यान् स स्थायी लवणाकरः ॥ ४-३४

सजातीयविजातीयभावान्तरैरतिरस्कृतत्वेनोपनिबध्यमानो रत्यादिः स्थायी । यथा बृहत्कथायां नरवाहनदत्तस्य <sup>1</sup>मदनमञ्जर्यामनुरागः तत्तदवान्तरनायिकानुरागैरतिरस्कृतः स्थायी । यथा च मालतीमाघवे श्मशानाङ्के भीमत्सेन मालत्यनुरागस्य अतिरस्कारो “ मम हि प्राक्तनोपलम्भसम्भावि-

1 Printed text (NSP edn 1941) reads Madana-  
mañjūṣayām

तात्मजन्मनः संस्कारस्यानवरतप्रबोधात् प्रतापमानस्तद्विसदृशैः प्रत्ययान्तरै-  
रतिरस्कृतप्रवाहः प्रियतमाप्रत्ययोत्पत्तिसन्तानस्तन्मयमिव करोति <sup>२</sup>वृत्तिसारू-  
प्यतश्चैतन्यम् ” इत्यादिनोपनिबद्धः । तदनेन प्रकारेण विरोधिनामविरोधि-  
नाञ्च समावेशो न विरोधी ।

2 Printed text has “antarvṛtti-”.

(मद्वृत्तिहस्य लघुटीका)

विरुद्धैरविरुद्धैर्वेति । अस्यार्थः=विरुद्धैरविरुद्धैर्वा भावैर्वा आहितः  
संस्कारो न विच्छेदी भवति, प्रत्युत तान् सर्वान् आत्मभावं नयति, स  
स्थायी भावो लवणाकरः । लवणाकरबल्लवणाकरः । उक्तं हिः—

“ यथा रुमायां लवणाकरेषु मेरी यथा वोज्जवलरुवममूमै  
यज्जायते तन्मयमव तत् स्यात् ” इति ।

(तन्त्रवार्तिकम्-आनन्दाश्रम-पुटे २०७)

विरुद्धाविरुद्धाविच्छेदित्वमन्यद् अनुत्पाद्येतिवृत्तेषु अन्यद् उत्पाद्ये-  
तिवृत्तेषु च प्रबन्धेषु <sup>१</sup>दृष्टमित्याह-यथेत्यादिना ।

1 Adyar Grantha Ms reads : *iruddhāvicchēdatām anyat utpādyetviratesu utpādyetvṛttesu prstam ityāha* The Telugu Ms (Adyar) and Madras Govt transcript give as *iruddhāviruddhāvicchēdatām anutpādyetvṛttesu* On I-15 of the DR Bhattanrsimha explains before that *prakhyāta* is of two types *itihāsakathātaḥ prasiddham*, *lokakathataḥ prasiddham* And about *utpādyā* he says *yatra itivṛttam karibuddhyāna kalpyate tad utpādyam* From this it appears that any *itivṛtta* based on *brhatkathā* (ie *lokakathā*) is treated by him as *lokakathātaḥ prakhyātam* (ie *anutpādyā*) and the story of *Mālatīmādhava* will be *utpādyam* As both are cited in the *Avaloka* for illustration, I think that the sentence intended here must have reference to both. Therefore I gave it as *anyad anutpādyetvṛttesu anyad utpādyetvṛttesu ca prabadndhesu drstam ityāha*

(अवलोकः)

तथाहि । कथं विरोधः ? सहानवस्थानम्, बाध्यबाधकभावो वा ? उभयरूपो<sup>3</sup> न तावत् । स्वादात्मनि<sup>4</sup> तस्य एकरूपत्वेनाविर्भावात् । स्थायिनां विभावादीनां<sup>5</sup> च यदि विरोधः, तत्रापि न तावत् सहानवस्थानम् । रत्याद्युपरक्ते चेतसि स्रक्सूत्रन्यायेन अविरोधिनां व्यभिचारिणां विरोधिनां चोपनिबन्धः समस्तभावकस्वसवेदनसिद्धः । यथैव च स्वसंवेदनसिद्धस्तथैव काव्यव्यापारसरम्भेण अनुकार्येऽप्यावेद्यमानः स्वचेतसमेदेन<sup>6</sup> तथाविधानन्दसंविदुन्मीलनहेतुः सम्पद्यते ।

तस्मान्न तावद् भावानां सहानवस्थानम् । बाध्यबाधकभावो<sup>7</sup> हि भावान्तरैर्भावान्तरतिरस्कारः । स च व्यभिचारिणा स्थायिना न विरोधः<sup>8</sup> (सम्भवति) । व्यभिचारिभिः (च) स्थायिनो न विरुद्धाः<sup>9</sup> । तेषामङ्गत्वात् ।

3 NSP edition gives *ubhayarupenāpi*

4 This is a better reading than *tādātmyasya eka-* etc given in print

5 It is not clear why it is *vibhāvādīnām* As he is discussing the *virodha* between *sthāyibhāva* and *vyabhicāri-bhāva*, *bhavādīnām* perhaps would be suitable I do not know whether *vyabhicārīns* are also referred to as *vibhāvas* in any text

6 Adyar Ms (Telugu) reads *svasamvedanena* But I have given the reading according to the *pratīka* cited by Bhaṭṭaṅṣiṃpha

7 Printed text has *bādhyabādhakabhāvas tu*, but what is given above is the *pratīka* in the commentary

8 Adyar Ms reads *viruddhak* and without *sambhavati* The reading given above is based on the interpretation and wording of Bhaṭṭaṅṣiṃpha

9 The MS reads *viddhāh* which is obviously a mistake of the scribe

प्रधानविरुद्धस्य चाङ्गत्वायोगात् । आनन्तर्यविरोधोऽपि<sup>10</sup> अनेनैव<sup>11</sup> प्रकारेणापास्तः (सन्) न सम्भवति<sup>12</sup> । तथा च मालतीमाघवे शृङ्गारानन्तरं भीमत्सोपनिबन्धेऽपि न किञ्चिद् वैरस्यम् ।

तदेवमवस्थिते<sup>13</sup> विरुद्धरसैकालम्बनत्वमेव विरोधहेतुः<sup>14</sup> । स तु अविरुद्धरसान्तरव्यवधानेनोपनिबध्यमानो न विरोधी । यथा :-

10 MS reads -*virodhitam* ap: Bhattanrsimha gives the above reading

11. MS reads *anena prakārena* Bhattanrsimha gives *anenaita prakārena*

12 Printed text and MS have *apāstam bhavati*

13 Perhaps the reading was *atasthito* Or else we may supply *sthāyīnah sthāyīnantareṇa virodha ity asmin visaye* to be construed with the locative *atasthite*.

14 Printed text has *virodhe hetuh*

(लघुटीका)

अविच्छेदं प्रतिज्ञातमुपपादयति तथाहीत्यादिना । कथमिति<sup>1a</sup> । अत्र स्यायिनः स्याय्यन्तरेण विरोधत्वात् तिष्ठतु । किं तु स्यायिनः परिपोषकतया निधीयमाना विभावादय एव यदि तं विरुद्ध्युस्तर्हि का गतिरिति चेत् तत्राह—स्यायिनां प्रमाणादीनाञ्च यदि विरोध इति । हेतुमाह—रत्याद्युपरक्ते इति । यदा हि रत्याद्युपरक्ते भवति मनस्तदा तद्विरोधिनां जुगुप्सादीनाम् अविरोधिनामुत्कण्ठादीनां तेन रत्यादिना

1a From the commentary it appears that there was perhaps the reading of *katham* before *virodhah* in the *Avaloka*

सहभावो दृष्टः । यथाशुक्ल<sup>२</sup>शृङ्गापुष्पसम्भेदेऽपि अनुभूयन्मय सवत्सुरस्येत्यर्थः ।  
न केवलं दर्शनमेव । तयैवोपनिबन्धोऽपीत्याह-यथैवेति । स्वचेतस्सम्भेदे-  
नेति । यक्ष्यति हि रसाविर्भावप्रकारमुपपादयन्

“स्वादः काव्यार्थसम्भेदादात्मानन्दसमुद्भव ” इति । (४-४३)

एवंप रिहृतं सहानवस्थानमुपसंहरति—तस्मादिति । बाध्यवध-  
कभावलक्षणस्य विरोधस्याप्यभावं वर्णयन् तत्स्वरूपं तावदाह —  
बाध्यवधप्रकारभावो हीति । स हि रत्याद्याहितसंस्कारस्य भावान्तरैर्विच्छेदः ।  
स्वरूपस्य पुनरुत्तरकालीनेन प्रत्ययान्तरेणैव विच्छेदादिति । एवं स्वरूपं  
परिशोध्य<sup>३</sup>—द्वावेव पक्षौ सम्भवतः; व्यभिचारिभावास्ते विरन्धताम्,  
व्यभिचारिणो वा विरन्धुरिति । तत्र तेषां व्यभिचारिभिर्विरोधो न सम्भवति ।  
स्थायित्वात् । व्यभिचारिणाञ्च अस्थायित्वात् । स्थायित्वञ्च विषयामणीयकेन  
तेषां सम्भवति । व्यभिचारिणाञ्च अस्थायित्वं स्वरूपमेव “स्थायिन्युन्मग्न-  
निर्मगना” इति वचनात् (दशरूपकम्—४-७) । स्थायिविरुद्धानामपि  
व्यभिचारित्वे न सम्भवति । तान् प्रति तेषामङ्गत्वात् । प्रधानानुक्लं  
खल्वङ्गं भवति । न तु तद्विरुद्धम्—<sup>३</sup>इत्याह स चेति । ननु मामूद्  
यौगपद्वयेन विरोधः । स्थायिभावानन्तरमेव विजातीयानां निबन्धः एकवाक्ये  
विरुद्ध इत्यस्माभिरुच्यत इति चेत् तत्राह — आनन्तर्यविरोधोऽपीति ।  
अनेनैव प्रकारेण = प्रधानविरुद्धस्याङ्गत्वं न सम्भवतीति प्रकारेण ।  
तदेवं स्वाङ्गभूतैर्भावैः स्थायिभावानां न कश्चिद् विरोध इत्युक्तम् ।  
स्थायिनः स्थाय्यन्तरेण विरोध इति तु परिशिष्यते । तत्राह —

2 Kṛṣṇa is a synonym of nila in Sanskrit. So here it must mean some blue flowers like nilotpala.

3 parisodhya is connected with ity aha coming before sa ceti.

तदेवमिति । स्यायिनो रसस्य अङ्गभूतैरपि रसान्तरेरेकाश्रयत्वं<sup>4</sup> परिहर-  
णीयमित्यर्थः । किं तत् सर्वथा त्यजनीयमेव तेषाम् एकाश्रयत्वम्<sup>4</sup> नेत्याह  
— स त्रिति ।

After this, comes the portion

*vyavadhānena avirodham udāharati*, etc

which was given earlier on page 52

4 The *Ataloka viruddharasakālabhanatvam etā vīro-  
dhahetuḥ* is being explained in this sentence. Bhattanrsimha  
by his comment using *ekāśrayatvam* seems to take the two  
expressions *ekālabhanatvam* and *ekāśrayatvam* to convey the  
same idea, and not in the restricted senses involving a differ-  
ence between *alambana* and *āśraya* as noted by later writers  
like Viśvanātha and others



## ERRATA

<i>Page</i>	<i>Read</i>
10, line 23	-bījārtha-
19 verse 4, second line,	prajñāṅg
22 Footnote, first line (for than)	then
22       "       third line (for that)	ta
24 verse 24, first line	vithyāngāṅg
30 verse 54,   "   "	gnāpyam
32 verse 61,   "   "	ankantapatraṅg
50 Footnote, line 8	point
52 line 17	udāharatḥ
58 lines 1-2	(various) battles